

COLOR: FROM BARYON SPECTROSCOPY TO QCD

O.W. Greenberg¹

Center for Theoretical Physics

Department of Physics and Astronomy

University of Maryland

College Park Maryland 20742-4111, U.S.A.

Talk presented at the session “Thirty years of the quark model”
at Baryons '92, June 1-4, 1992, Yale University.

To appear in the Proceedings.

University of Maryland Preprint No. 92-241

Abstract

I review the discovery of the color degree of freedom in hadronic physics, and the developments which led from that discovery to the local gauge theory of color, quantum chromodynamics.

1. DEDICATION

I dedicate this talk to the memory of Feza Gürsey, a person of great kindness and great insight, whom we miss very much at this conference. I first met Feza at a seminar he gave at Brandeis University in 1957. A few years later, in 1962, Feza organized a wonderful Summer School in what was then called the Robert College in Bebek, near Istanbul. The participants spent about a month in a lovely setting overlooking the Bosphorus, eating meals together, attending and giving lectures, and discussing physics at all hours. Suha Gürsey charmed everybody with her gracious hospitality. Feza, in addition to providing his own insights, had assembled a stellar set of lecturers including Giulio Racah, Eugene Wigner, Louis Michel, Sheldon Glashow, Yoichiro Nambu and Abdus Salam. The proceedings are still worth reading.[1]

¹Supported in part by the National Science Foundation. e-mail addresses: greenberg@umdhep (bitnet); umdhep::greenberg (decnet); greenberg@umdep1.umd.edu (internet).

2. THE $SU(6)$ OF GÜRSEY AND RADICATI

Since this session is devoted to the history of the quark model, I will give some personal reminiscences about some of the early work on the model. I first heard rumors about the idea of fractionally charged quarks in the winter of 1963-1964. One of my first reactions was to wonder why three quarks or one quark and one antiquark should be the only combinations which would stick together, a question not addressed by the original version of the model due to Murray Gell-Mann[2] and to George Zweig.[3]

In the summer of 1964, I returned to Maryland from France where I had collaborated with Albert Messiah on a series of articles on parastatistics. Although I was scheduled to spend the Fall semester of 1964 at the Institute for Advanced Study and would not be at Maryland for the Fall semester seminars, my colleagues asked me to invite Feza, who was then at Brookhaven National Laboratory, to give a seminar at Maryland. When I spoke with Feza, he mentioned that he had just finished some interesting work with Luigi Radicati, that an article on this work would soon appear in Physical Review Letters, and that I should read it when it appeared. When I reached Princeton, I found that the paper of Gürsey and Radicati[4] on relativistic $SU(6)$ was the center of interest. Several people at the Institute started working on developments of the idea of higher relativistic symmetries, among them Korkut Bardakci, John Cornwall, Peter Freund and Benjamin Lee. I eagerly read the Gürsey-Radicati paper. The main idea was that the flavor degree of freedom of quarks, $q \sim (u, d, s)$, in $SU(3)_f$ could be combined with their spin degree of freedom, $(1/2) \sim (\uparrow, \downarrow)$, in $SU(2)_S$ to be a

$$\mathbf{6} = (q \ 1/2) \sim (u_\uparrow, u_\downarrow, d_\uparrow, d_\downarrow, s_\uparrow, s_\downarrow) \text{ in } SU(6)_{fS}. \quad (1)$$

This $\mathbf{6}$ reduces to the direct product of a quark triplet and a spin doublet under

$$SU(6)_{fS} \rightarrow SU(3)_f \times SU(2)_S = (u, d, s,) \times (\uparrow, \downarrow) = (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1/2}). \quad (2)$$

The Gürsey-Radicati $SU(6)$ theory successfully places the mesons $\sim q\bar{q}$ in

$$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}^* = \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{35}, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{35} \rightarrow (\mathbf{8}, \mathbf{0}) + (\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{8}, \mathbf{1}) \text{ under } SU(6)_{fS} \rightarrow SU(3)_f \times SU(2)_S \quad (4)$$

The well-known pseudoscalar meson octet $(K^+, K^0, \pi^+, \pi^0, \pi^-, \eta^0, \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^-)$ and the vector meson nonet $(K^{*+}, K^{*0}, \phi^0, \rho^+, \rho^0, \rho^-, \omega^0, \bar{K}^{*0}, \bar{K}^{*-})$ are unified. For the

baryons $\sim qqq$ in

$$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} = \mathbf{56} + \mathbf{70} + \mathbf{20}, \quad (5)$$

Gürsey and Radicati choose the **56** which includes the known nucleon octet and delta decuplet

$$\mathbf{56} \rightarrow (\mathbf{8}, \mathbf{1/2}) + (\mathbf{10}, \mathbf{3/2}) \text{ under } SU(6)_{fS} \rightarrow SU(3)_f \times SU(2)_S, \quad (6)$$

where the nucleon octet is $(p^+, n^0, \Lambda^0, \Sigma^+, \Sigma^0, \Sigma^-, \Xi^0, \Xi^-)$ and the delta decuplet is $(\Delta^{++}, \Delta^+, \Delta^0, \Delta^-, Y_1^{*+}, Y_1^{*0}, Y_1^{*-}, \Xi^{*0}, \Xi^{*-}, \Omega^-)$.

3. THE STATISTICS PARADOX

I noticed that the representation which fit the low-lying baryons, the **56**, had the three quarks in a symmetric state under permutations, in contradiction with what one would expect from the assumption that quarks have spin 1/2 which would require they obey the Pauli exclusion principle. The idea of an $SU(6)_{fS}$ symmetry which combines the $SU(3)_f$ of the then-known three flavors with the $SU(2)_S$ of spin was found independently by Bunji Sakita[5] and by Zweig.[6] Because I had spent a good part of the previous two years working on parastatistics, I immediately thought about the possibility of fixing up the quark statistics by assuming quarks obey parafermi statistics of order three, since then up to three quarks can be in a symmetric state. I knew that the celebrated spin-statistics theorem, usually stated “Particles which obey Bose statistics must have integer spin and particles which obey Fermi statistics must have odd-half-integer spin” should be amended to read “*Given the choice between parabose and parafermi statistics, each of integer order p , particles which obey parabose statistics must have integer spin and particles which obey parafermi statistics must have odd-half-integer spin.*”[7] The cases for $p = 1$ are the usual Bose and Fermi statistics. The order of the parastatistics for quarks in baryons is uniquely fixed by the two requirements that the three quarks be in a symmetric state and that the proton and other baryons not have any additional degeneracy besides the known spin degeneracy. It was easy to show that the composite state in which the three quarks are symmetric under permutations is an effective fermion. It was also clear that the statistics issue did not enter for mesons, since they are composed of two dissimilar particles, namely a quark and an antiquark.

I will give only the briefest description of parastatistics,[8] using the example of parafermi statistics which is relevant here. Let q be a parafermi field of order p . Then q can be expanded in terms of p “Green component” fields $q^{(\alpha)}$,

$$q = \sum_{\alpha=1}^p q^{(\alpha)}, \quad (7)$$

$$[q^{(\alpha)}(x), q^{(\alpha)\dagger}(y)]_+ = \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), x^0 = y^0, \quad (8)$$

$$[q^{(\alpha)}(x), q^{(\beta)}(y)]_- = 0, x^0 = y^0, \alpha \neq \beta, \quad (9)$$

where $[A, B]_{\pm} = AB \pm BA$. Thus the Green components behave as fermions for the same value of the Green index and as bosons for different values of this index. I emphasize that parastatistics is a perfectly valid local, relativistic theory with positive probabilities. In fact, parastatistics is equivalent as a classification symmetry to a theory with a hidden p -valued degree of freedom,[9, 10] which, for the hadrons, we now call “color.” The composite Fermi baryon creation operator can be written in terms of the quark fields as

$$B_{abc}^{\dagger} = [[q_a^{\dagger}, q_b^{\dagger}]_+, q_c^{\dagger}]_+ = 4 \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta \neq \gamma \neq \alpha=1}^3 q_a^{(\alpha)\dagger} q_b^{(\beta)\dagger} q_c^{(\gamma)\dagger}, \quad (10)$$

where a, b, c are the “visible” space-flavor-spin indices and α, β, γ are the hidden “para” or color indices. The boson composites in the parafermi theory are in one-to-one correspondence with the color-singlet mesons in the $SU(3)_c$ theory and the fermion composites are in one-to-one correspondence with the color-singlet baryons.

At least five possible solutions to the paradox of the apparent violation of the spin-statistics theorem were considered:

1. Quarks are just a mathematical fiction, not real particles, so the spin-statistics theorem can be ignored. Some theorists considered the “real” physics to lie in the algebras constructed using certain fields. By analogy with haute cuisine, in which hummingbirds’ tongues are cooked between two slices of veal after which the veal is thrown away, once the algebra was constructed, the fields and any associated objects could be discarded. I unequivocally took the point of view that quarks are real particles.
2. Quarks are indeed fermions; the statistics paradox is removed by the ground-state baryons having a totally antisymmetric space wavefunction. The simplest

polynomial in the quark coordinates multiplying the exponentially decreasing factor is $(\mathbf{x}_1^2 - \mathbf{x}_2^2)(\mathbf{x}_2^2 - \mathbf{x}_3^2)(\mathbf{x}_3^2 - \mathbf{x}_1^2)$, since the state has to have $L = 0$. (The polynomial $\mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{x}_2 \cdot \mathbf{x}_3$ vanishes identically because the coordinates are linearly dependent.) Such a ground-state wavefunction has two problems: (a) It is not clear what to choose for excited states. The suggestion that $q\bar{q}$ pairs should be added for excited states leads to “exploding” $SU(3)_f$ representations which are not observed. (b) Ashok Mitra and Rabi Majumdar[11] and Rodney Kreps and Johann de Swart[12] pointed out that zeroes in the ground-state wavefunction would lead to zeroes in the proton form factors, which also are not observed.

3. Quarks obey parastatistics. I am discussing this possibility here.
4. There are three equivalent triplets which belong to a $\mathbf{3}$ of $SU(3)_c$. The new three-valued degree of freedom can be chosen antisymmetric to resolve the statistics paradox. As a new degree of freedom, this is equivalent to parastatistics.
5. There are three different triplets; this degree of freedom can also be chosen antisymmetric and the charges can be chosen integral. Moo Young Han and Yoichiro Nambu proposed this model[13] in 1965. I discuss this possibility below.

4. MAGNETIC MOMENTS OF THE PROTON AND NEUTRON

Ben Lee showed me the manuscript of his article with Mirza Bég and Abraham Pais[14] which derived the ratio of the magnetic moments of the proton and neutron, the famous $\mu_p/\mu_n = -3/2$, which is accurate to 3%. Previous work on these magnetic moments had assumed that in lowest approximation the proton and neutron are pointlike Dirac particles, in which case this ratio is infinity (but nobody considered the ratio), and tried to get the observed magnetic moments by adding anomalous contributions coming from strong interaction effects, such as pion clouds. Not only was this complicated; it also totally failed to account for the observed moments. No one had even noticed that the ratio of the total moments was such a simple number. The Bég, Lee, Pais paper used pure relativistic $SU(6)$ group theory to derive this result. I was very impressed by this calculation and became convinced that the quark model was correct in a very concrete sense: that quarks are real and that the hadrons are literally made of them.

I realized that the parastatistics scheme is equivalent for baryons to a model in which the quarks obey Bose statistics and could be represented by Bose annihilation and creation operators, and I set up the S-wave quark states for the proton and neutron in each spin state. Using these states it was easy to calculate the magnetic

moments of the proton and neutron and, in particular, their ratio. In this way I recovered the Bég, Lee, Pais result on the basis of a concrete model of quarks.[15]

I remind you of this elementary calculation here. As I just mentioned above, once you take care of the statistics for the spin-flavor degrees of freedom using parafermi quarks of order three, you can use Bose operators for the spin-1/2 quarks. The key observation is that $O_{AB} \equiv \epsilon^{ab} a_{Aa}^\dagger a_{Bb}^\dagger$, where A, B stand for the flavor indices with $1 = u$, $2 = d$, $3 = s$ and a, b stand for the spin indices with $1 = \uparrow$, $2 = \downarrow$, has strangeness zero and the isospin of an antisymmetric state of q_A and q_B . Thus O_{AB} serves as the “core” of all the states in the nucleon octet (except Σ^0 , which can be made from Σ^+ using the isospin-lowering operator I_-), with the third quark carrying the net spin and isospin of the baryon. Then, writing out the terms with the ϵ , the proton is

$$|p_\uparrow^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} u_\uparrow^\dagger (u_\uparrow^\dagger d_\downarrow^\dagger - u_\downarrow^\dagger d_\uparrow^\dagger) |0\rangle \quad (11)$$

and the neutron is

$$|n_\uparrow^0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} d_\uparrow^\dagger (u_\uparrow^\dagger d_\downarrow^\dagger - u_\downarrow^\dagger d_\uparrow^\dagger) |0\rangle. \quad (12)$$

The magnetic moment of a baryon B is

$$\mu_B = \langle B_\uparrow | \mu_3 | B_\uparrow \rangle, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\mu_3 = 2\mu_0 \sum_q Q_q S_q, \quad Q_q = \left(\frac{2}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}\right) \quad (14)$$

is the charge of the quarks (u, d, s) and S_q is the z -component of the spin of quark q . From (13) and (14), the proton magnetic moment is

$$\mu_p = 2\mu_0 \cdot \frac{1}{3} \left\{ 2 \left[\frac{2}{3} \cdot 1 + \left(-\frac{1}{3}\right) \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) \right] + \left[\left(-\frac{1}{3}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \right] \right\} = \mu_0; \quad (15)$$

the two square brackets inside the curly bracket come from the two non-interfering terms in the proton state, the two multiplying the first square bracket is a normalization factor from the two spin up u quarks, the terms inside the first square bracket reflect the charge and spin of the u and d quarks and similar comments hold for the second square bracket. The analogous calculation for the neutron magnetic

moment gives

$$\mu_n = -\frac{2}{3}\mu_0. \quad (16)$$

Thus the evaluation of the magnetic moments is just a matter of counting. The ratio of the moments is $-3/2$, and the calculation of the individual moments can be interpreted as just adding up the Dirac moments of the quarks in S states with the spin-flavor wavefunction given by the **56**, provided the quarks have constituent masses of $m_N/2.79 = 336\text{MeV}$.

5. THE SYMMETRIC QUARK MODEL FOR BARYONS

I felt that something more had to be done to justify the idea that quarks obey parastatistics, and decided that I should study the orbitally-excited baryon states which would lie just above the ground-state **56**. At this stage, I felt the need of a collaborator and approached Ben Lee, asking if he would join me in this work. After a day or so, Ben said that he was too busy working on relativistic $SU(6)$ inspired by the paper of Gürsey and Radicati with some other people at the Institute. I then decided to pursue this work by myself. My development of the paraquark model benefited from discussions with Alex Dragt, Peter Freund, Ben Lee and Samuel MacDowell. I would also like to acknowledge the attentive ear of Guido Sandri. The Institute is an ideal place for such work, free from distractions, yet with many stimulating people to talk to. I worked very intensively at this project. In three weeks, I wrote and submitted my paper to Physical Review Letters. In the evening of the day I had put the manuscript in the mail, I realized that I had ignored the question of center-of-mass motion, so that some of the excited states I had predicted were either wholly or in part just the ground state **56** in motion. For example, if $a^\dagger$'s create S -wave quarks and $b^\dagger$'s create P -wave quarks, $(a^\dagger a^\dagger b^\dagger + a^\dagger b^\dagger a^\dagger + b^\dagger a^\dagger a^\dagger)|0\rangle$ is just the ground-state **56**; while $a^\dagger(a^\dagger b^\dagger - b^\dagger a^\dagger)|0\rangle$ and $(2b^\dagger a^\dagger a^\dagger - a^\dagger a^\dagger b^\dagger - a^\dagger b^\dagger a^\dagger)|0\rangle$ are the true first excited states, the **(70, $L^P = 1^-$)**. I called Sydney Meshkov at the National Bureau of Standards to get some clues as to how to eliminate these spurious states, and spent the remainder of the night rewriting the paper. I submitted the revised paper the next day. In the end it turned out that some of my states still had some partial admixture of center-of-mass motion. The correct states found later by Gabriel Karl and Edward Obryk[16] use the traceless modes, rather than the single-particle states. Possibly Gabriel will say something about that later this evening. In those days, Samuel Goudsmit was editor of Physical Review Letters, and he made

decisions about publication without protracted debates among referees, divisional associate editors and authors. In three more weeks, my paper was in print. [15]

Naturally, I gave a copy of my paper to Robert Oppenheimer, who was Director of the Institute. A week or so later, there was an Eastern Theoretical Physics Conference at the new Center of Adult Education at my home institution, the University of Maryland. I recall verbatim his comments when I encountered him at the conference. He said “Your paper is beautiful,” and I went into an excited state; then he continued “but I don’t believe a word of it.” That brought me back to my ground state.

Later that fall, I was asked to give a seminar at Harvard. After the seminar, in the parking lot coming back from lunch, Julian Schwinger remarked that the extra degree of freedom implicit in the parastatistics model ought to play a dynamical role. A prescient comment, which to my chagrin I did not follow up.

6. THE INTRODUCTION OF COLOR $SU(3)$

Han and Nambu[13] were the first who explicitly introduced the color $SU(3)_c$ symmetry which is implicit in the parastatistics model. One of their motivations was to avoid fractional quark charges, so they arranged for their three flavor triplets to have different electric charges : $(1, 0, 0)$; $(1, 0, 0)$; $(0, -1, -1)$ so that they are distinguishable. Averaging over the charges for each flavor gives the fractional charges of the original quark model. They proposed that the forces between these quarks would be mediated by the exchange of an $SU(3)_c$ -octet of gauge vector mesons, thus giving the hidden color degree of freedom a dynamical role, and showed that such forces would make the $SU(3)_c$ -singlets be the ground-state particles, to be identified with the known baryons and mesons.

QCD consists of two statements: (a) there is a hidden three-valued degree of freedom carried by quarks and (b) this degree of freedom is associated with a local $SU(3)_c$ gauge theory with its octet of vector mesons serving to mediate the strong force between the quarks. The parastatistics model, translated to explicit triplets, requires identical triplets and accounts for (a). The Han-Nambu model accounts for (b). Thus the union of the correct parts of these two models is the basis of QCD.

While preparing for this session, I looked into the origin of the use of the word “color” for the gauged $SU(3)_c$ degree of freedom. Bram Pais,[17] in a discussion in the Erice summer school of 1965, was the first to use color in this way. Donald

Lichtenberg[18] also used color with this meaning in his book published in 1970. Color in this sense came into general use following the articles by Gell-Mann and by William Bardeen, Harald Fritzsch and Gell-Mann.[19]

In 1965, Daniel Zwanziger and I followed up the work of Han and Nambu[13] to account for the fact that only the combinations of quarks and antiquarks, qqq and $q\bar{q}$, which form baryons and mesons appear in Nature. Even now there are no definitely established states beyond these. We surveyed the existing models and tried to construct new models to account for this fact. We noticed that the parastatistics model is equivalent to the three-triplet or color model as far as the spectrum of color-singlet states is concerned. As mentioned above, the composite particles which are bosons in the parastatistics model are color-singlet mesons in the color model and the particles which are fermions in the parastatistics model are color-singlet baryons in the color model. We found convincing arguments that only the parastatistics model and its equivalent, the color model, can account for the “saturation” found in Nature.[9]

7. DEVELOPMENT OF THE SYMMETRIC QUARK MODEL FOR BARYONS

In 1966 I developed the idea, which I had sketched in my 1964 paper, that the forces between quarks should mainly be two-body forces and applied this simplifying assumption to the baryons in the ground-state ($\mathbf{56}, \mathbf{L}^P = \mathbf{0}^+$) and the first excited supermultiplet, the ($\mathbf{70}, \mathbf{L}^P = \mathbf{1}^-$), which I had earlier noted should have odd parity. I asked one of our postdoctoral fellows at Maryland, Marvin Resnikoff, to join me on this project.

I will briefly describe the simplifications which follow from the two-body force assumption. In $SU(6)_{fS}$, the quark is a $\mathbf{6}$ which reduces to a $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2})$ under $SU(6)_{fS} \rightarrow SU(3)_f \times SU(2)_S$, where the $SU(3)_f$ is the flavor symmetry of the u, d and s quarks and the $SU(2)_S$ is the spin symmetry of the quarks. As already mentioned, the quarks in a baryon must be totally symmetric under permutations of all their degrees of freedom except color. For the baryon $\mathbf{56}$, in which the space wave function is symmetric, the two-body forces act on the symmetric part of $\mathbf{6} \times \mathbf{6}$, which is the $\mathbf{21}$ of $SU(6)$. Thus the two-body forces must be in $\mathbf{21} \times \mathbf{21}^*$, which reduces to $\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{35} + \mathbf{405}$. The one-body forces or masses must be in $\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{35}$. Further, the forces must be singlets under spin and isospin and have hypercharge zero. Finally, one

assumes dominance of operators in a flavor octet. With these conditions, there are precisely four possible mass operators, and they lead to the Gürsey-Radicati mass formula,

$$M = M_0 + M_1 Y + M_2 C_2^{(3)} + M_3 [I(I+1) - \frac{1}{4} Y^2], \quad (17)$$

where I, Y and $C_2^{(3)}$ are the hypercharge, isospin and quadratic Casimir of $SU(3)_f$, respectively. This gives four mass relations,

$$N + \Xi = \frac{1}{2}(3\Lambda + \Sigma), \quad \Omega - \Xi^* = \Xi^* - Y_1^* = Y_1^* - \Delta = \Xi - \Sigma \quad (18)$$

among the eight masses in the $(\mathbf{56}, \mathbf{0}^+)$. The last of these, which relates mass splittings in the octet and decuplet, is the most interesting. By contrast, without two-body dominance the most general mass operator acting on the $\mathbf{56}$ is in $\mathbf{56} \times \mathbf{56}^* = \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{35} + \mathbf{405} + \mathbf{2695}$. Since there are eight admissible mass operators in these representations, no mass relations follow. Resnikoff and I applied these ideas to the $(\mathbf{56}, \mathbf{0}^+)$ and the $(\mathbf{70}, \mathbf{1}^-)$, fitting all the available baryon resonances and predicting the remaining ones in these representations. We felt that we should study the resonances with S - and P -wave quarks in a unified way. While we were completing our work, Pedro Federman, Hector Rubinstein and Igal Talmi[20] published a paper on the baryons in the $(\mathbf{56}, \mathbf{0}^+)$ from a similar point of view. Our fit to the resonances convinced me, but at the time not too many others, that the “symmetric” quark model is correct for baryons, and therefore that color or its equivalent, parastatistics is present in Nature. I presented our results at the Washington meeting of the American Physical Society in April of 1966. The last step in the calculation was to get the best fit to all the resonances. Since there are resonances which can be superpositions of three states in the model with the same values of I, Y and S , I used a primitive Basic program to do the fitting. I recall running the program on a computer at Dartmouth over telephone lines which would fail from time to time. I sent an expository article based on my talk reviewing the state of hadron spectroscopy to Physics Today, which aged the manuscript for about a year and then rejected it. Resnikoff and I published a technical paper on our work in Physical Review.[21] A year or so later, I supervised a thesis of Dattaprasad Divgi which extended the results on baryon spectroscopy and also calculated baryon decays.[22] Richard Dalitz and his students extended the study of baryon spectroscopy to higher

supermultiplets.[23] With the advent of QCD, the general group theory plus two-body force analysis could be replaced by a definite Hamiltonian for the constituent quarks, and results from the quantum mechanics of the Coulomb potential could be applied to baryon spectra. The pioneers in this subject were Alvaro De Rujula, Howard Georgi and Sheldon Glashow,[24] and the people who developed this work to a fine art were Nathan Isgur and Gabriel Karl.[25] I look forward to Gabriel's talk later this evening.

8. GRADUAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE QUARK MODEL WITH COLOR

Although the baryon spectroscopy, the magnetic moment calculation, the quark counting relations which relate meson-baryon total cross sections to baryon-baryon total cross sections,[26] the Zweig rule[3, 27] forbidding decays such as $\phi \rightarrow \rho\pi$ in which no quarks are in common in the initial and final states, which were found in the period 1964-1966, convinced many, including myself, that quarks exist as concrete objects and are fundamental for hadron physics, others held back. Some who accepted quarks held out against color. The first rapporteur talk on hadron spectroscopy which advocated the symmetric quark model for baryons was given by Haim Harari[28] at the Vienna conference in 1968. Some of the holdouts were convinced by the success of Feynman's parton model,[29] with quarks and antiquarks as the partons as suggested by James Bjorken and Emmanuel Paschos[30], after the SLAC deep inelastic scattering experiments in 1969. We will hear more about this from Finn Ravndal. The understanding that the J/Ψ and related resonances are charm-anticharm composites in 1974 finally convinced the remaining holdouts.

Several of the effects due to color depend only on color as a classification symmetry; these, of course, follow equally from the parastatistics model. Among these are (a) the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay rate,[31] which is proportional to the square of the number of colors, since the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ amplitude is proportional to the number of quark fields which circulate in the triangle in the graph for this amplitude and it doesn't matter whether these quark fields are Green components of an order-3 parafermi field or the components of a color triplet and (b) the ratio of the cross section for electron-positron annihilation to hadrons to the cross section for annihilation to muon pairs,[32] which is proportional to the number of colors, because it doesn't matter whether Green or color components circulate in the loop for the total

hadron cross section. By contrast, the property of asymptotic freedom,[33] that the interaction between quarks falls to zero at short distance or, equivalently at high energy, requires the gauged theory of color $SU(3)_c$, QCD. We believe that QCD also leads to permanent confinement of quarks, antiquarks and other color-carrying objects into colorless $SU(3)_c$ -singlets and thus explains the absence of free quarks with fractional electric charge. (Parenthetically, later Kenneth Macrae and I were able to construct a version of the parastatistics theory which can be gauged and is equivalent to QCD.[34])

9. GOALS FOR THE FUTURE

I conclude by emphasizing that a full understanding of hadrons based directly on the Lagrangian of QCD is still lacking. I believe that it is possible to solve QCD with sufficient accuracy to derive the constituent quark model, including masses, decays, magnetic moments and other static properties of hadrons, to demonstrate permanent confinement of quarks and other color-carrying objects, to derive chiral symmetry and its breaking in their respective regimes, and at the same time to derive the parton model for both deep inelastic lepton-hadron and high momentum-transfer hadron-hadron scattering. To realize these goals using continuum quantum field theory methods remains a challenge for the future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank George Snow and Joseph Sucher for reading the manuscript and for helpful comments on it.

References

- [1] *Group Theoretical Concepts and Methods in Elementary Particle Physics*, ed. F. Gürsey (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1965). The school is described in O.W. Greenberg and E.P. Wigner, *Physics Today* **16** (1963) 62.
- [2] M. Gell-Mann, *Phys. Lett.* **8** (1964) 214.
- [3] G. Zweig, CERN Reports 8182/TH.401 and 8419/TH.412 (1964). The latter is reprinted in *Developments in the Quark Theory of Hadrons*, ed. D.B. Lichtenberg and S.P. Rosen (Hadronic Press, Nonantum, Mass., 1980).

- [4] F. Gürsey and L.A. Radicati, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 173.
- [5] B. Sakita, *Phys. Rev.* **136B** (1964) 1756.
- [6] G. Zweig, in *Symmetries in Elementary Particle Physics*, ed. A. Zichichi (Academic, New York, 1965) p. 192.
- [7] G.F. Dell’Antonio, O.W. Greenberg and E.C.G. Sudarshan, in *Group Theoretical Concepts and Methods in Elementary Particle Physics*, ed. F. Gürsey (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1965) p. 403.
- [8] H.S. Green, *Phys. Rev.* **90** (1953) 270; O.W. Greenberg and A.M.L. Messiah, *Phys. Rev.* **138** (1965) B1165.
- [9] O.W. Greenberg and D. Zwanziger, *Phys. Rev.* **150** (1966) 1177.
- [10] K. Drühl, R. Haag and J.E. Roberts, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **18** (1970) 204.
- [11] A.N. Mitra and R. Majumdar, *Phys. Rev.* **150** (1966) 1194.
- [12] R.E. Kreps and J.J. de Swart, *Phys. Rev.* **162** (1967) 1729.
- [13] Y. Nambu, in *Preludes in Theoretical Physics*, ed. A. de Shalit, H. Feshbach and L. Van Hove (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1966), p. 133; M.Y. Han and Y. Nambu, *Phys. Rev.* **139** (1965) B1006. A. Tavkhelidze, in *High-Energy Physics and Elementary Particles* (Int. Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, 1965), also suggested three different triplets with integral charges, but did not suggest the gauge interaction.
- [14] M.A.B. Bég, B.W. Lee and A. Pais, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 514, erratum 650. The magnetic moment ratio was found independently by B. Sakita, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 643.
- [15] O.W. Greenberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 598.
- [16] G. Karl and E. Obryk, *Nucl. Phys.* **B8** (1968) 609.
- [17] A. Pais, in *Recent Developments in Particle Symmetries*, ed. A. Zichichi (Academic, New York, 1966) p. 406.
- [18] D.B. Lichtenberg, *Unitary Symmetry and Elementary Particles* (Academic, New York, 1970) p. 227.

- [19] M. Gell-Mann, *Elementary Particle Physics*, ed. P. Urban (Springer, Vienna, 1972); *Acta Phys. Austriaca Supp.* **9** (1972) 733; W.A. Bardeen, H. Fritzsch and M. Gell-Mann, in *Scale and Conformal Symmetry in Hadron Physics*, ed. R. Gatto (Wiley, New York, 1973) p 139.
- [20] P. Federman, H.R. Rubinstein and I. Talmi, *Phys. Lett.* **22** (1966) 203.
- [21] O.W. Greenberg and M. Resnikoff, *Phys. Rev.* **163** (1967) 1844.
- [22] D.R. Divgi, *University of Maryland Thesis* (1968) and *Phys. Rev.* **175** (1968) 2027; D.R. Divgi and O.W. Greenberg, *Phys. Rev.* **175** (1968) 2024, erratum **178** (1969) 2487.
- [23] R.H. Dalitz, in *Fundamentals of Quark Models*, ed. I. M Barbour, A.T. Davies (Scottish Univ. Summer School, Edingburgh, 1977).
- [24] A. DeRújula, H. Georgi and S.L. Glashow *Phys. Rev. D* **12** (1975) 147.
- [25] N. Isgur and G. Karl, in *Recent Developments in High-Energy Physics*, ed. A. Perlmutter and L.F. Scott (Plenum, New York, 1980) p. 61.
- [26] E.M. Levin and L.L. Frankfurt, *JETP Lett.* **2** (1965) 199 (English translation).
- [27] S. Okubo, *Phys. Lett.* **5** (1963) 165.
- [28] H. Harari, in *14th Int. Conf. on High-Energy Physics*, ed. J. Prentki and J. Steinberger (CERN, Geneva, 1968) p. 195.
- [29] R.P. Feynman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23** (1969) 1415 and *Photon-Hadron Interactions* (W.A. Benjamin, Reading, Mass., 1972).
- [30] J.D. Bjorken and E.A. Paschos, *Phys. Rev.* **185** (1969) 1975.
- [31] S.L. Adler, *Phys. Rev.* **177** (1969) 2426; J. Bell and R. Jackiw, *Nuovo Cimento* **60A** (1969) 47.
- [32] N. Cabibbo, G. Parisi and M. Testa, *Nuovo Cimento Lett.* **4** (1970) 35.
- [33] D. Gross and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30** (1973) 1343; H.D. Politzer, *ibid* 1346.
- [34] O.W. Greenberg and K.I. Macrae, *Nucl. Phys. B* **219** (1983) 358.